REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

By this Amendment, the specification is amended, Claim 6 is canceled, Claims 1-5, 7-12, 14-26, 28 and 30-32 are amended and Claims 33, 34 are added. Claims 1-5 and 7-34 are pending.

The Examiner sets forth that Claims 25 and 28-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention and that Claim 25 recites the limitation "The system of Claim 14" in line 1. The Examiner believes that there is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Claim 25 is believed by the Examiner to depend from Claim 21 and not Claim 14.

The Examiner further sets forth that Claim 28 recites the limitation "said indicator" in line 4 of page 35 and the Examiner believes there is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim with respect to Claims 30-31. The Examiner sets forth that Claims 30-31 recite the limitation "the method of Claim 21" in the line 1 of the claims and that there is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Claims 30 and 31 are believed by the Examiner to depend from Claim 28 and not Claim 21. Furthermore, the Examiner sets forth that Claim 32 recites the limitation "the method of Claim 23" in line 1 of the claim. The Examiner believes there is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. The claims have been amended accordingly.

According to the Examiner, Claims 1, 7-8, 11-15, and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by United States Patent no. 6,370,537 to Gilbert, et al. (hereinafter

"Gilbert"). Referring to Claim 1, the Examiner sets forth that Gilbert discloses a method for

delivering information to a person accessing a banner website from a terminal located remote from

the source of the banner website, the terminal having an associated display upon which the content

of the website is visually perceived by a person using the terminal and a cursor whose position is

controllable by the person. The Examiner directs the Applicants attention to col. 17, lines 12-30,

which the Examiner believes describe how the banner is determined by an ad server, which is remote

from the user's terminal. According to the Examiner, Fig. 26 shows a website, whose content is

visually perceived by the user, with banner 2600 and col. 17, lines 44-47 describe how the user may

move the mouse, which controls the position of a cursor.

The Examiner further sets forth that the method of Gilbert provides initial signals from the

source of the website or from another remote source when the website is accessed by the person to

establish a banner area on the display (col. 17, lines 12-21), the banner area including banner

information that is visually perceivable by the person when the website is accessed and plural sub-

areas of the banner area. The Examiner cites Fig. 26, banner 2600, which shows three sub-areas

(frames). The Examiner directs the Applicants' attention to col. 17, lines 40-44, which the Examiner

believes describe how the banner may be split into frames.

The Examiner believes that the method of Gilbert enables the person to control the cursor

to position the cursor on any one of the sub-areas of the banner to provide a selected sub-area,

whereupon the person is automatically provided with respective additional visually perceivable

information associated with the selected sub-area, the additional visually perceivable information

being provided without requiring other action by the person, the respective additional visually

perceivable information being imperceivable by the person until the cursor is located on the selected

sub-area. The Examiner directs the Applicants' attention to col. 17, lines 44-53, which the Examiner

believes describes how a mouse over an image in one of the frames causes a pop-up window

(visually perceivable) to be displayed, which provide additional information associated with the

selected sub-area (frame).

Referring to Claims 7-8, the Examiner sets forth that the initial signals of Gilbert carry the

instructions necessary for enabling the terminal to establish the additional visually perceivable

information (pop-up) when in receipt of appropriate date, and the method of Gilbert re-accesses the

source of the website or accesses another source for receiving the data upon which the instructions

operate to provide the additional visually perceivable information. The Examiner directs the

Applicants' attention to col. 17, lines 25-31 and 50-54.

Referring to Claims 11-12, the Examiner sets forth that the method of Gilbert receives the

visually perceivable banner information, first identification data representative of the visually

perceivable banner information, the additional visually perceivable information, and second

identification data representative of additional visually perceivable information. The Examiner

believes col. 17, lines 25-31 and 50-54, describes how the banner information and additional

information are served from an ad server, and therefore must be received by the terminal. According

to the Examiner, the method of Gilbert specifies a placement of the additional visually perceivable

information with respect to the visually perceivable banner information according to the first and

second identification data and Fig. 26 shows the pop-up window (additional information) in relation

to the banner.

Referring to Claim 13, the Examiner sets forth that the method of Gilbert must build a use

map in accordance with the first and second identification data to associate the appropriate pop-up

window with the appropriate image (sub-area) in the banner. The Examiner directs the Applicants'

attention to col. 17, lines 44-47 and to col. 12, lines 20-28.

Referring to Claim 14, the Examiner sets forth that Gilbert discloses that the step of

providing additional visually perceivable information comprises the steps of building a pop-up

function in accordance with the additional visually perceivable information (col. 17, lines 44-47),

adding HTML information to the pop-up function to provide an enhanced pop-up function (col. 17,

lines 47-50 and col. 12, lines 26-28), and displaying the visually perceivable banner information and

the additional perceivable information in accordance with the enhanced pop-up function. The

Examiner directs the Applicants' attention to col. 17, lines 40-50 and the pop-up associated with

banner 2600 in Fig. 26.

Referring to Claim 15, the Examiner sets forth that Gilbert discloses the step of altering

associations between the sub-area (frames) and the respective additional visually perceivable

information and repeating step (b), and the Examiner directs the Applicants' attention to col. 17,

lines 17-31 and 50-54, which the Examiner believes describes how the content of the pop-up

(additional visually perceivable information) and banner are determined by the ad server and may

be changed by the advertiser.

Referring to Claim 19, the Examiner sets forth that Gilbert discloses transmitting a request having request information to a server database (ad server) on a further website containing stored visually perceivable information in response to the positioning of the cursor on the selected sub-area (frame), selecting the additional visual information (pop-up window) from the stored visual information in response to the request information and transmitting the selected stored visual information to the banner website. The Examiner directs this Applicants' attention to col. 17, lines 44-54.

Referring to Claim 20, the Examiner sets forth that the terminal of Gilbert provides a terminal display having a display iframe comprising the steps of displaying the visually perceivable banner information within the display iframe and displaying the additional visually perceivable information in response to positioning the cursor on the iframe. The Examiner directs the Applicants' attention to col. 17, lines 12-47 and Fig. 26.

The Examiner further sets forth that Claims 2, 6, 9-10, 21, and 25-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gilbert. Referring to Claim 2, the Examiner believes that Gilbert shows a pop-up window associated with banner 2600 in Fig. 26, which substantially crosses the lower boundary of the banner area, but that Gilbert does not explicitly show the pop-up window (visually perceivable information) provided substantially outside the boundaries of the banner area. However, according to the Examiner, pop-up windows may be placed anywhere within a display and may comprise different sizes. As an example, the Examiner directs the Applicants' attention to Fig. 18 of Gilbert, which the Examiner believes show a pop-up window (1802), substantially outside of

the boundaries of banner area (1801). According to the Examiner, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the pop-up window of Gilbert substantially outside of the boundaries of the banner area, in order to prevent covering up the banner, and reducing its visibility or to enlarge the pop-up window to draw attention to it.

Referring to Claim 21, the Examiner sets forth that Gilbert discloses a system for delivering information to a person accessing a banner website from a terminal located remote from the source of the banner website, the terminal having an associated display upon which the content of the website is visually perceived by a person using the terminal and a cursor whose position is controllable by the person. The Examiner directs the Applicants' attention to col. 17, lines 12-30, which the Examiner believes describes how the banner is determined by an ad server, which is remote from the user's terminal. The Examiner also believes that Fig. 26 shows a website, whose content is visually perceived by the user, with banner 2600, and that col. 17, lines 44-47 describes how the user may move the mouse, which controls the position of a cursor.

According to the Examiner, the system of Gilbert provides initial signals from the source of the website or from another remote source when the website is accessed by the person to establish a banner area on the display (col. 17, lines 12-21), the banner area including banner information that is visually perceivable by the person when the website is accessed and plural sub-areas of the banner area. The Examiner sets forth that Fig. 26, banner 2600, shows three sub-areas (frames) and that col. 17, lines 40-44, describes how the banner may be split into frames.

The Examiner further sets forth that the initial signals of Gilbert enable the person to control the cursor to position the cursor on any one of the sub-areas of the banner area to provide a selected sub-area, whereupon the person is automatically provided with respective additional visually perceivable information associated with the selected sub-area, the additional visually perceivable information being provided without requiring other action by the person, the respective additional visually perceivable information being imperceivable by the person until the cursor is located on the selected sub-area and that col. 17, lines 44-53, describes how a mouse over an image in one of the frames causes a pop-up widow (visually perceivable) to be displayed, which provides additional information associated with the selected sub-area (frame).

The Examiner believes that Gilbert shows a pop-up window associated with banner 2600 in Fig. 26, which substantially crosses the lower boundary of the banner area, but that Gilbert does not explicitly show the pop-up window (visually perceivable information) is provided substantially outside the boundaries of the banner area. However, pop-up windows may be placed anywhere within a display and may comprise different sizes according to the Examiner and as an example, cites Fig. 18 of Gilbert, which the Examiner believes shows a pop-up window (1802), substantially outside of the boundaries of banner (1801). In the Examiner's opinion, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the pop-up window of Gilbert substantially outside of the boundaries of the banner area, in order to prevent covering up the banner, and reducing its visibility or to enlarge the pop-up window to draw attention to it.

Referring to Claim 28, the Examiner sets forth that Gilbert discloses a method of enabling

a user on a website to traverse a banner presented on the website to display an image (pop-up) in

response to the traversing of the banner and that the method of Gilbert provides the banner with a

selected hot spot having an associated image (col. 17, lines 45-47), activates the hot spot when an

indicator (mouse) traverses the selected hot spot and enables the associated image (pop-up) when

the traversed spot is activated to provide an enabled image (col. 17, lines 44-47 on how a pop-up is

displayed in response to a mouse, and the pop-up window over (adjacent) the banner 2600 in Fig.

26.

The pop-up window does not have a button in the window for closing the window ('x'), and

therefore is believed by the Examiner to remain enabled as long as the indicator (mouse) is disposed

on the pop-up (enabled image), and the pop-up is removed when the mouse is moved off of it. It is

typical for a mouse over event to last as long as the mouse (cursor) remains positioned over the

image associated with the mouse over. The Examiner sets forth that Official Notice of this teaching

is taken. The Examiner believes it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to

ensure the pop-up window of Gilbert remains open as long as the cursor remains over the enabled

image (pop-up), because the lack of movement of the cursor indicates the user is still reading the

additional information.

Referring to Claims 6, 9, and 25, the Examiner sets forth that the pop-up window of Gilbert

(additionally visually perceivable information) is displayed in a region (window) adjacent to the

selected sub-area (frame). The Examiner cites the pop-up window over (adjacent) the banner 2600

in Fig. 26. According to the Examiner, the pop-up window does not have a button in the window for closing the window ('x'), and therefore is believed to remain perceivable to the person as long as the cursor remains on the selected sub-area (frame) or on the pop-up window and it is typical for a mouse over event to last as long as the mouse (cursor) remains positioned over the image associated with the mouse over. The Examiner takes Official Notice of this teaching. The Examiner believes it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to ensure the pop-up window of Gilbert remains open as long as the cursor remains on the selected sub-area (frame) or the pop-up window (region), because the lack of movement of the cursor indicates the user is still reading the additional information.

Referring to Claim 10, the Examiner sets forth that the additional visually perceivable information of Gilbert contains link information for linking the person to a further website when the person clicks on the selected region. The Examiner directs the Applicants' attention to col. 17, lines 48-64.

Referring to Claims 26-27, the Examiner sets forth that the initial signals of Gilbert carry the instructions necessary for enabling the terminal to establish the additional visually perceivable information (pop-up) when in receipt of signals transmitted from a further website in response to the instructions, and that the initial signals of Gilbert require re-accessing the further website for selecting the transmitted signals. The Examiner directs this Applicants' attention to col. 17, lines 25-31 and 50-54.

Referring to Claim 29, the Examiner sets forth that in the method of Gilbert, a further website is associated with the associated image (pop-up) and further comprises the step of clicking on the enable image and transporting the user to the further website in response to the clicking. The Examiner cites col. 17, lines 48-64.

Referring to Claim 30, the Examiner sets forth that the banner in Gilbert is provided with a further hot spot and comprises the step of traversing the hot spot by the indicator (mouse) within the banner and enabling a further associated image (pop-up) in response thereto. According to the Examiner, col. 17, lines 40-47, describe how the banner may be divided into frames, each having an associated pop-up on a mouse over.

Referring to Claim 31, the Examiner set forth that the indicator of Gilbert is directed by a mouse and the user traverses the hot spot without clicking on the right or the left button of the mouse and cites col. 17, lines 44-47, which the Examiner believes describe how a mouse over causes the pop-up to be displayed (activates the hot spot).

Referring to Claim 32, the Examiner sets forth that Gilbert discloses the step of altering associations between the hot spots (frames) and the associated images and enabling the further associated image when the selected hot spot is traversed. The Examiner directs the Applicants' attention to col. 17, lines 17-31 and 50-54, which the Examiner believes describe how the content of the pop-up (additional visually perceivable information) and banner are determined by the ad server and may be changed by the advertiser.

The Examiner further sets forth that Claims 3-5 and 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gilbert and U.S. Patent No. 6,496,857 to Dustin, et al. (hereinafter Dustin). According to the Examiner, with respect to Claims 3-5 and 22-24, Gilbert discloses additional perceivable information in the form of a pop-up window, but does not explicitly describe that the pop-up window contains audio information, video information, or mixed media information. However, the Examiner believes that Dustin describes a method for enhancing advertisements, which provides ads that contain audio, video, and/or mixed media information (col. 3, lines 5-8). According to the Examiner, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to enhance the pop-up window advertisement of Gilbert, such that they include audio, video, and/or mixed media information for a more effective form of advertisement as supported by Dustin according to the Examiner.

The Examiner further sets forth that Claims 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gilbert and U.S. Patent No. 6,401,075 to Mason, et al. (hereinafter Mason). According to the Examiner, with respect to Claims 16-18, Gilbert discloses that the advertisement may be customized according to a user profile or at the discretion of the advertiser (col. 17, lines 21-31), but that Gilbert does not explicitly altering the associations between the sub-areas and the additional visually perceivable information in accordance with recorded performance parameters. However, the Examiner believes Mason discloses methods of monitoring internet advertising, in which parameters (which are predetermined) representative of the advertisements (i.e. click-through) are recorded to provide recorded performance parameters, and the advertisements presented are

altered in accordance with the recorded performance parameters (col. 2, lines 39-51). According to

the Examiner, altering the advertisements in accordance with the recorded performance parameters

is repeated to provide the advertiser with accurate results of the success of the advertisement and it

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the associations between the

frames of the banner (sub-areas) and the pop-up window (additional visually perceivable

information) of Gilbert in accordance with recorded performance parameters as taught by Mason in

order to provide the advertiser with information on the success or the advertisements in the pop-up

window and alter the pop-up window and banner accordingly as supported by Mason.

Gilbert teaches projects which include a meta object layout and a number of meta objects,

wherein meta layout contains the mapping information of the meta objects. The meta objects contain

linked nodes of a hierarchal data structure and the mapping information is used for mapping the meta

objects to the display. Queries taught by Gilbert retrieve projects, and thereby the meta objects

within them, are adapted to return data as query results which are then passed to the display.

The banner ads taught by Gilbert have pop-up windows linked thereto and can provide access

to the content of the meta objects by permitting the display of the content in response to navigating

through the banners. Gilbert teaches displaying the content in a content window outside of the

banner with which the meta objects are associated. In order to do this, Gilbert sets forth that: "[T]he

viewer's browser is first enabled by an applet embedded in the web page. This applet allows the end

user to view the banner ad in its intended rendering without any user intervention or downloading

of software."

It is well-known in the art that the "applets" referred to by Gilbert comprise precompiled Java instructions which provide the programming for performing the pop-up operations. Although it is not explicitly taught by Gilbert, it is well-known in the art that the execution of the Java instructions for permitting the performance of these operations requires the system upon which the applet is operating to invoke a <u>Java virtual machine</u>. It is the operation of the Java virtual machine upon the applet that permits the precompiled instructions to be executed.

When additional content is displayed in response to navigating a banner <u>in the context of advertising message information speed is a very critical issue</u>. This is true because most viewers will not wait very long for an advertisement to appear. It is typical for prior art operating with the applet method taught by Gilbert to require several seconds to provide a display of the associated content when the viewer navigates to a selected sub-area of a banner. During a time period of this duration it is quite typical for the viewer's eyes to have moved away from the vicinity of the advertisement. Thus, the advertisement will not have its maximum impact in the prior art method since the display of the associated content is not virtually immediate.

It is the problem of providing a virtually immediate display of associated advertising message information that the Applicants' invention has solved. The Applicants recognized that the time between navigating to the selected sub-area of the banner and the display of the associated content could be <u>substantially reduced if Javascript rather than Java applets</u> is used to provide the instructions controlling the display.

Furthermore, practitioners skilled in the relevant art <u>would consider the prior art to teach</u> <u>away from this conclusion</u>, since it is well known that the use of precompiled code will usually speed up the execution of instructions since it eliminates the time needed for the compilation of uncompiled code at the time of execution. Thus, the Applicants' inventive contribution is in recognizing that the required operations would be substantially speeded up by eliminating the need to invoke the Java virtual machine, even though additional time would then be required to compile the uncompiled code at the time of execution.

The Applicants' method, which thus runs counter to the conventional wisdom in the field, has produced substantial improvements in speed. Using Applicants' method the speed for producing a visual display of content after navigation to the selected sub-area is well under a second, usually on the order of approximately .8 seconds, compared with several seconds using the prior art applet method. The improvement in speed provided thereby has thus met a long felt need in the field.

Additionally, the Applicants' method has met with considerable commercial success. The success was well illustrated by the fact that the largest consumer of the services provided by the Applicants has, since the introduction of the Applicants' method, required all banners carried on its system to use this method in order to improve the overall system throughput.

Dustin teaches delivering targeted enhanced advertisements across electronic networks. In the system taught by Dustin equipment at the user site sends a notification when the user clicks on a specific portion of a displayed advertisement. In response to the clicking on the advertisement an enhanced version of the advertisement enhanced is accessed. At a later time, the user can request

access to the enhanced information. In one embodiment of the Dustin system a stream of thumbnails of enhanced versions of the information can be displayed on the user's screen. However, the thumbnails are transmitted in response to clicking on a specified designation within the banner, rather than in response to merely navigating to one of a plurality sub-areas in the banner. Selected thumbnails within the plurality of thumbnails can be enlarged by navigating to them. Dustin does not teach the user of Javascript to perform any of these operations.

Mason teaches a method for obtaining an advertisement, modifying the advertisement to fit designated spaces for differing web sites, and placing the differing advertisements at the differing web sites. In the method taught by Mason, an original advertisement is loaded into a central processor and used to form derivative advertisements that conform to the configuration parameters of a plurality of selected web sites. The properly configured derivative advertisements are then transmitted to their corresponding web sites. Parameters such as the number of hits or click throughs obtained by the advertisements are monitored. Mason does not teach the automatic provision of additional visually perceivable information corresponding to a selected sub-area when a user positions the cursor on a sub-area whatsoever. Furthermore, Mason does not teach the use of Javascript to perform any of these operations.

The Applicants' invention is a method for delivering information to a person accessing a banner having a plurality of sub-areas. When the person positions a cursor on a selected sub-area additional visually perceivable information associated with the selected sub-area is displayed by means of Javascript. The additional visually perceivable information in the Applicant's system is

advertising message information which must be displayed virtually immediately upon positioning the cursor on the sub-area of the banner, in order to obtain its maximum effect. It is the use of Javascript, rather than precompiled Java or applets, to create such a display that permits the required virtually immediate display of the associated information. The additional advertising message information that is displayed in this manner continues to be displayed as long as the cursor is positioned on the banner or on the additional information.

Therefore, the Applicants' amended Claim 1 sets forth a method for delivering information to a person accessing a banner web site from a terminal located remote from a source of the banner web site, the terminal having an associated display upon which content of the web site is visually perceived by the person using the terminal and a cursor whose position is controllable by the person. The method of Claim1 recites the step of providing initial signals from the source of the web site or from another remote source by means of Javascript when the web site is accessed by the person to establish a banner area on the display, the banner area having banner boundaries and including (i) banner advertising message information that is visually perceivable by the person when the web site is accessed and (ii) plural sub-areas of the banner. Enabling the person to control the cursor and to position the cursor on any one of the sub-areas of the banner to provide a selected sub-area is also recited. When this occurs, the person is automatically provided by means of Javascript with respective additional visually perceivable advertising message information associated with the selected sub-area. The additional visually perceivable advertising message information is provided without requiring other action by the person and the additional visually perceivable advertising

message information is displayed in a selected region of said display. Amended Claim 1 further sets forth enabling the person to control the cursor to position the cursor on the selected region and that the respective additional visually perceivable advertising message information is imperceivable by the person until the cursor is located on the selected sub-area and remains perceivable to the person as long as the cursor is positioned on the sub-area or the selected region.

Amended Claim 21 sets forth a method for delivering advertising messages to a person accessing a web site from a terminal located remote from the source of the web site, the terminal having an associated display upon which the content of the web site is visually perceived by a person using the terminal and a cursor whose position is controllable by the person. The system includes means coupled to the source of the web site or to another remote source for providing initial signals from the source of the web site or from the other remote source when the web site is accessed by the user to establish a banner area on the terminal <u>by means of Javascript</u>. The banner area includes banner advertising message information that is visually perceivable by the person when the web site is accessed and plural sub-areas of the banner area. The initial signals cause the terminal to provide respective additional visually perceivable advertising message information associated with a selected sub-area <u>by means of Javascript</u>, when the cursor is located over the selected sub-area. The additional visually perceivable advertising message information is provided by the terminal substantially outside the boundaries of the banner area and without requiring other action by the person. The respective additional visually perceivable advertising message information is imperceivable by the person until the cursor is located on the selected sub-area.

The Applicants' amended Claim 28 sets forth a method of enabling a user on a web site to traverse a banner presented on the web site using an indicator to display an image in response to the traversing of the banner. Amended Claim 28 recites the steps of providing the banner <u>by means of Javascript</u> wherein the banner has a first hot spot with an associated image and activating the first hot spot when the indicator traverses the first hot spot. Enabling the associated image of the first hot spot <u>by means of Javascript</u> when the first hot spot is activated to provide an enabled image is also set forth. The indicator is moved to the enabled image and the enabled image is retained while the indicator is disposed on the enabled image and the enabled image is removed <u>by means of Javascript</u> when the indicator is moved off the enabled image.

Gilbert does not teach or suggest providing initial signals <u>by means of Javascript</u>, providing additional visually perceivable advertising message information <u>by means of Javascript</u> establishing a banner area on a terminal <u>by means of Javascript</u>, or removing an enabled image <u>by means of Javascript</u>. Each of the Applicants' amended independent Claims 1, 21 and 28 requires one or more of the foregoing limitations and is thus directed to a method that is substantially faster than methods using precompiled Java.

Rather, Gilbert teaches the use of applets, which are known to include <u>precompiled Java instructions rather than Javascript</u> to perform the operations of providing banners and pop-ups. This teaching in Gilbert does not suggest the Applicants' novel use of Javascript to solve the problem of displaying advertising message information immediately. Conversely, the Applicants' solution to the problem of speeding up the display of the advertising message information using Javascript <u>is</u>

taught away from by the prior art in the field. The prior art suggests that using uncompiled code would be slower rather than faster due to the fact that the uncompiled code would have to be compiled at the time the instructions are executed. There is no suggestion in Gilbert or the other known prior art that eliminating the calling up of the virtual machine required to execute the precompiled code speed up the process rather than slow it down. Therefore, Gilbert does not teach performing the claimed operations by means of Javascript as set forth in the Applicants' amended Claims 1, 21 and 28.

Dustin does not teach or suggest providing initial signals by means of Javascript, providing additional visually perceivable advertising message information by means of Javascript establishing a banner area on a terminal by means of Javascript, or removing an enabled image by means of Javascript. Rather, Dustin is silent with respect to the use of precompiled Java instructions or Javascript to perform the operations of providing banners and pop-up. Therefore, Dustin does not teach performing the claimed operations by means of Javascript as set forth in the Applicants' amended Claim 1, 21 and 28.

Mason does not teach or suggest providing initial signals by means of Javascript, providing additional visually perceivable advertising message information by means of Javascript establishing a banner area on a terminal by means of Javascript, or removing an enabled image by means of Javascript. Rather, Mason is silent with respect to the use of precompiled Java instructions or Javascript to perform the operations of providing banners and pop-ups. Therefore, Mason does not

teach performing the claimed operations <u>by means of Javascript</u> as set forth in the Applicants' amended Claims 1, 21 and 28.

Thus, none of the references cited by the Examiner, Gilbert, Dustin and Mason, teaches or suggests the use of Javascript to perform the operations set forth in the Applicants' amended Claims 1, 21 and 28. Furthermore, no combination of the references teaches or suggests this inventive feature.

For at least the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that the above-identified application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of the claims are respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further is desirable in order to place the application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

CAESAR, RIVISE, BERNSTEIN,
COHEN & POKOTILOW, LTD.

September 18, 2003

By _____
Frank M. Linguiti
Registration No. 32,424
Customer No. 03000
(215) 567-2010
Attorneys for Applicants

Please charge or credit our Account No. 03-0075 as necessary to effect entry and/or ensure consideration of this submission.